

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration

Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Kalispel Hatchery Pumphouse Improvements

Project No.: 1995-001-00

Project Manager: Virgil Watts, EWU-4

Location: Lake County, MT

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.3 Routine Maintenance

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to fund the the Kalispel Resident Fish Program to modify the existing surface water pumphouse infrastructure and upgrade the electrical panel utility meters and pump motors at the Kalispel Tribal Hatchery (KTH). The existing pumpstation would be renovated to raise the electrical components approximately six feet higher thus elevating them out of the 100-year floodplain of the Pend Oreille River, and to house two new pump motors.

The existing hatchery, which was funded by BPA and built in the 1990's, is located on the east bank of the Pend Oreille River, approximately nine miles north (downstream) of Usk, Washington. The current elevation of the pumphouse is below the 100-year floodplain which has caused inundation of the electrical equipment three times in the last 15 years, resulting in complete hatchery shutdown and loss of annual production. Pumps are 20 years old, nearing their operational life expectancy; the proposed replacements (vertical turbines) are more reliable and require less maintenance.

The approximately 10-foot by 15-foot pumphouse would retain the same footprint and the floor, walls and roof would be raised with minimal ground disturbance. The roof would be detached and re-installed after the walls are raised. The area around the existing pumphouse is constrained by the river, sloughs, and wetlands, resulting in very little space available for constructing a new one without impacting sensitive areas. The existing diked access road would be used to access to the pumphouse for the improvement activities, and materials and equipment would be staged on existing disturbed ground within the hatchery facility.

Findings: In accordance with Section 1021.410(b) of the Department of Energy's (DOE) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations (57 FR 15144, Apr. 24, 1992, as amended at 61 FR 36221-36243, July 9, 1996; 61 FR 64608, Dec. 6, 1996, 76 FR 63764, Nov. 14, 2011), BPA has determined that the proposed action:

- (1) fits within a class of actions listed in Appendix B of 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D (see attached Environmental Checklist);
- (2) does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal; and
- (3) has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion.

Based on these determinations, BPA finds that the proposed action is categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

/s/ Jennifer Snyder

Jennifer Snyder
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Flux Resources, LLC

Reviewed by:

/s/ David K. Kennedy

David K. Kennedy
Executive Manager
Environmental Planning and Analysis

Concur:

/s/ Stacy L. Mason

Stacy L. Mason
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: February 13, 2017

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist

Categorical Exclusion Environmental Checklist

This checklist documents environmental considerations for the proposed project and explains why the project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources and would meet other integral elements of the applied categorical exclusion.

Proposed Action: Kalispel Hatchery Pumphouse Improvements

Project Site Description

The Kalispel Tribe Hatchery and pumphouse are located on the northern boundary of the Kalispel Tribe Reservation, on the east bank of the Pend Oreille River, approximately nine miles north (downstream) of Usk, Washington. The area around the existing pumphouse, which lies about 0.5 miles west of the hatchery buildings, includes the river, sloughs, and wetlands. Vegetation on the property includes pasture hay, reed canary grass, snowberry, hawthorn, black cottonwood, willows, ponderosa pine, and red-osier dogwood.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

Environmental Resource Impacts	No Potential for Significance	No Potential for Significance, with Conditions
1. Historic and Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> BPA determined that the project has no potential to affect historic properties because work would occur on a structure constructed in the 1990's that is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and construction equipment and materials staging would cause minimal ground disturbance within previously developed areas.		
2. Geology and Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> No-to-minimal ground disturbance would be expected as work will occur on an existing facility structure and equipment access would be within the previously developed areas and access road right-of-way.		
3. Plants (including federal/state special-status species)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> No vegetation would be removed or disturbed.		
4. Wildlife (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> All work would occur on an existing facility structure; no habitat would be disturbed.		
5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> No in-water work would occur and no-to-minimal ground disturbance would be expected, so adjacent water bodies would not be affected.		

6. **Wetlands**

Explanation: No soil disturbance is expected and wetlands in the vicinity would not be affected.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**

Explanation: All work would occur on an existing facility structure. There will be minimal ground disturbance within the existing access road right-of-way.

8. **Land Use and Specially Designated Areas**

Explanation: No changes to land use are proposed nor would any traditional activities be interrupted.

9. **Visual Quality**

Explanation: The proposed modifications would not change the look or character of the site.

10. **Air Quality**

Explanation: Any potential dust or other particulates generated during the maintenance activity would be minimal and temporary.

11. **Noise**

Explanation: Noise generated during the maintenance activity would be localized and temporary in nature.

12. **Human Health and Safety**

Explanation: Maintenance activities would not impact human health or safety.

Evaluation of Other Integral Elements

The proposed project would also meet conditions that are integral elements of the categorical exclusion. The project would not:

- Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orders.

Explanation, if necessary:

- Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.

Explanation, if necessary:

- Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA excluded petroleum and natural gas products that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases.

Explanation, if necessary:

- Involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or

invasive species, unless the proposed activity would be contained or confined in a manner designed and operated to prevent unauthorized release into the environment and conducted in accordance with applicable requirements, such as those of the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Institutes of Health.

Explanation, if necessary:

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

Description: BPA is coordinating with the Kalispel Tribe; there would be no visual or other effects to adjacent landowners.

Based on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts to any environmentally sensitive resource.

Signed: /s/ Jennifer Snyder
Jennifer Snyder – ECF-4

Date: February 13, 2017